

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed from the United States Patent and Trademark Office on December 23, 2010, claims 1-24 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-16 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malec et al. (5,295,064) in view of Vogelman et al. (5,264,822) in further view of Ruppert et al. (5,640,002). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully provides the following:

Examiner Interview:

Applicants express appreciation to Examiner Mark Geiger for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney on June 9, 2011. At that time the application and outstanding Office Action were discussed. The prior art was discussed, specifically the Malec reference. The differences between the prior art and the claimed invention were discussed. In addition, claim amendments as set forth above were discussed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-16 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,295,064 ("Malec") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,264,822 ("Vogelman") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,640,002 ("Ruppert") and claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malec in view of Vogelman in further view of Ruppert in further view of MacIntyer.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited in the Office Action, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations claimed in the claim set provided herein. Applicants also respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner, and that one of skill in the art would not reasonably expect success in combining the references in the manner provided.

Malce, Voelman, and Ruppert fail to teach "the display unit being integrated into the handle of the shopping cart, the display unit having the display unit having a power source located within the handle of the shopping cart." Thus, these references fail to teach or suggest all the limitations claimed in the claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the present rejections to claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not made obvious by the cited combination of references and therefore respectfully request removal of the rejection. Claims 2-24 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants therefore respectfully request removal of all remaining rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 13 day of June, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael P. Krieger
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,232
KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 321-4814
Facsimile: (801) 321-4893